

1  
2  
3  
4  
5 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
6 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT TACOMA

7 RICHARD H. WARREN,

8 Plaintiff,

9 v.

10 STATE OF WASHINGTON,  
11 DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS,  
12 STAFFORD CREEK CORRECTIONS  
13 CENTER, ERIC JACKSON, DAN  
14 VAN OGLE, PAT GLEBE, CUS  
SHANAHAN, WILLIAM COPLAND,  
and ABRAM CLARK,

15 Defendants.

No. C11-5686 BHS/KLS

ORDER DENYING “OBJECTIONS” TO  
DISCOVERY

16 On April 2 and 5, 2012, Plaintiff filed “Objections and Responses to Defendants’  
17 Objections, Answers, and Responses” to discovery. ECF Nos. 39 and 40. Within these  
18 documents, Plaintiff asks the Court, *inter alia*, to compel the Defendants to provide complete and  
19 entire responses to his discovery requests. These documents were not filed as motions to compel  
20 and neither document contained a certification by Plaintiff that he has conferred with counsel for  
21 Defendants in an attempt to resolve any discovery dispute.

22  
23 While a party may apply to the court for an order compelling discovery “upon reasonable  
24 notice to other parties and all persons affected thereby,” the motion must also include a  
25 certification that the movant has in good faith conferred or attempted to confer with the person or  
26 party failing to make the discovery in an effort to secure the information or material without

1 court intervention.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 37(a)(2)(B). In addition, “[a] good faith effort to confer with  
2 a party or person not making a disclosure or discovery requires a face-to-face meeting or a  
3 telephonic conference.” Local Rule CR 37(a)(2)(A).

4 The Court anticipates that the parties will confer and make a good faith effort to resolve  
5 any discovery disputes without Court interference. If the parties cannot amicably resolve this  
6 issue, Plaintiff may file a motion to compel, and shall include a certification stating that their  
7 efforts were unsuccessful, and shall identify those areas of disagreement that remain unresolved.  
8 The Court will not address any motion which lacks such a certification.  
9

10 Accordingly, it is **ORDERED**:

11 (1) The Court will take no action on the documents filed at ECF Nos. 39 and 40.

12 (2) The Clerk of the Court shall send a copy of this Order to Plaintiff and to counsel  
13 for Defendants.  
14

15 **DATED** this 12th day of April, 2012.

16  
17   
18 Karen L. Strombom  
19 United States Magistrate Judge  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26